

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 19-33 are pending in the application, with claims 19, 25 and 31 being the independent claims.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the personal interview conducted on November 18, 2003. During the interview, independent claims 19, 25 and 31 were discussed with respect to the Noll reference as applied by the Examiner. The Applicants' representatives and the Examiner agreed that the Noll reference does not teach or suggest a data storage component configured to store torque data as claimed. In the Examiner's Interview Summary Record, the Examiner noted that the concept of a data storage component on the peripheral device was discussed. Applicants note that this distinction is a feature pursued in the dependent claims, but is not required in the independent claims to overcome the Noll reference.

Specification Objections

The specification is objected to because of a typographical error. Applicants have amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner.

Drawing Objections

The drawings stand objected to because certain reference numerals are absent from the figures. Applicants submit herewith drawing sheets indicating proposed changes in red ink. Applicants respectfully request approval of the proposed changes and that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 19 is objected to because of an antecedent bases issue. Applicants have amended claim 19 to overcome the objection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 19-22, 25-27 and 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,919,691 to Noll ("the Noll patent"). As discussed during the personal interview, the Noll patent does not teach or suggest "a data storage component configured to store torque data" as recited in independent claim 19. Additionally, the Noll patent does not teach or suggest "a local data storage component configured to store the plurality of torque data values" as recited in independent claim 25. Moreover, the Noll patent does not teach or suggest receiving "torque signal data from a local memory device" as recited in independent claim 31. For at least these reasons, independent claims 19, 25 and 31 are allowable over the cited references. Based at least on their dependence upon independent claims 19, 25 or 31, dependent claims 20-22, 26-27, 30 and 32-33 are also allowable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 23, 24, 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Noll patent. At least because of their dependence on independent claims 19 or 25, dependent claims 23, 24, 28 and 29 are also allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COOLEY GODWARD LLP

Date: January 20, 2004

By: _____



Erik B. Milch
Reg. No. 42,887

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
One Freedom Square
Reston Town Center
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston, Virginia 20190-5656
(703) 456-8000 – Phone
(703) 456-8100 – Facsimile